

THE DEMOCRATIC DILEMMA.

It is apparent that there is small chance of agreement on the tariff question between the two wings of the democratic party. The relations between the Carlisle and Randall factions are becoming more and more antagonistic every day. Manifestly the party is on the eve of a rupture on this important question. The statements furnished almost daily through our special dispatches are fully borne out by the experience of leading democratic journals received by mail. Note for example, the comments of the New York World on the Carlisle speech before the tariff commission, and the reply to the World by the Louisville Courier-Journal. The World declares that the speech "meant democratic disunion," and that the speaker's sentiments "do not represent more than an insignificant fraction of his party." The Courier-Journal says that the speaker's words were "pure democracy," and that they "expressed tersely and clearly the position of his party."

There has been nothing in our recent politics so significant as the bitter discussion now existing in the democratic party on this question. As represented in the house the free traders, or low tariff men, predominate in the party. But the protectionists are strong both in numbers and in power. It is to be seen within a day or two whether the party will have power to direct, plain the majority and force it to action in position or not. The strong probability is that it will fail, and that the principal result of the caucus will be to make the division wider and more irreconcilable than ever.

Both factions claim to represent the historical position of the democratic party on the tariff question, and each from its own standpoint is right. The Randall men, looking into the history of the founders of the party, find that they were all protectionists. Jefferson was a coat of domestic manufacture on the day of his inauguration, and Jackson, in numerous messages, thrilled the country with his utterances of protection doctrines. A great mass of literature is produced by the Randall faction, proving conclusively that the early and original democrats were all protectionists. The Carlisle faction answer by citing historical records to prove that during the last forty years the party has been distinctly and authoritatively committed to free trade, low tariff, and revenue reform. Both sides have the historical documents, for the "time-honored principle" in their day have had a varied history, and have looked all ways.

The principal fact is that the democratic party was strongly for protection down to the time when the interests of the southern states called for their domination of the party, which has now passed to this day, the doctrine of free trade and original democrats were not alone. Every purely agricultural country would free trade, and the south was devoting all its energies to raising cotton, tobacco, rice and sugar, and to breeding slaves for the agricultural labor market. The south in those days always called the party, the northern democrats greatly exhibiting under the threat of the slaveholders to do terrible things if they could not have their way.

But now it appears that the protection democrats of the northern states begin to feel that through the abolition of slavery they are being emancipated. Slavery being no more, there is no reason in the south to "petal institution" to be in awe of, and even the northern democrats would now laugh at a threat from the south to divide the union. Therefore the democrats of the manufacturing states of the north are plucking up a courage which they never exhibited before. The conditions have wholly changed. Democrats of the north now have a "petal institution" for which they demand protection. To protect "protection," they take a stand similar to that taken in the old days by the south to protect slavery, only there is not so much hot blood now, because the northern tariff is less excitable. But they go so far as to defy the majority, telling their party brethren that if they push the question their action will result in the division of the party. The question, however, is not altogether a new one, as the slavery question was, since there are protectionists in the south and free traders in the north. This question would be, but still it is serious enough to threaten gravely the unity of the party.

CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT.

In the recent article on the proposal of amendment to the constitution, which have been introduced in the present congress, we called attention to the fact that their general drift was in the direction of increasing the power of the federal government. The last decade has seen the remarkable instance of this tendency. In the decade in the senate upon the passage of the joint resolution making appropriation to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease, Mr. Ingalls, of Kansas, said that according to this device a majority of congress may be empowered to unlimited power, and that the senate will be the instrument of the people's choice. It is not twenty-five years ago when they insisted that whenever a majority of the people or a majority of their representatives in congress believe that any appropriation is necessary for the general welfare they cannot employ it.

This march of events is a direct great attention, and the important, which is causing much alarm. A senator who has been deeply interested in the progress of the legal tender case is reported to be amazed and alarmed by the decision. As the effect, he said, was the concession to a system of power to issue at will evidence of public indebtedness, and to endorse those who are with power to discharge all other debts, public or private, can be discharged by such means. There can be no limitation, and that takes away the barrier we all believed protected the editors of the government, and all other honest creditors, public or private. "It is," he added, "this government continues power that are not expressly delegated by the constitution, or granted by necessary implication, and it is in general to end in a national sovereignty, measured by the scale of European monarchies, unlimited and unnumbered grants of power, it is hard to tell what institution in the country, including the supreme court itself, is secure from attack." The decision of the court is in line with the history of the party, the theory of congress was compelled to do certain things, because it was not forbidden to do them, while the rule hitherto had been that it was compelled to do them because they were allowed.

If congress may do anything required by the "general welfare," and it is the sole judge of what the general welfare requires, he says, what government is there? The power of congress is unlimited, and the states are stripped of the power to manage their domestic affairs, and all the political power of the country may be consolidated at Washington. The theory of federalism upon which the days of the federal constitution is based virtually destroyed, that re-division of power between the federal government and the states, acting under express grants of power, and checking each other, which has been the admiration of the people. The supreme court, which a writer in the London Quarterly Review calls "not only a great power, but a source of a new creation of the founders of the constitution" has been repudiated nearly a century ago, and the power of the federal government is now in the hands of a few men, who are utterly failed to maintain its traditional character. This decision amounts to a substantial change in the nature of the government, leaving the country at the mercy of a few men, who can concentrate a large part of the property of the United States, whenever a majority of its members decide as a political question that the exigencies require an unlimited issue of greenbacks to pay for extravagant appropriations. The decision seems to have been reached, but as we have just seen, it is an extension of the power of the federal government, and a general feeling of either surprise, relief, alarm, sorrow or patriotic mortification among merchants, lawyers and leading business men in all parts of the country. The leaders of the opposition against the federal government of congress are alarmed and angry at the three original and equal departments of the government are left. The truth of De Tocqueville's remark seems destined to have an early fulfillment, that if the people accept this revolution in the constitution, "A democratic people" he said, "is not only led by its own taste to centralize in government, but the power of all the men by whom it is governed constantly use it in the same direction." Among the public men of democratic theory are hardly any but men of great distaste to the centralization of government; the former are serious, the latter are powerless.

AS TO TAXPAYERS.

Dr. Garde C. Strong, a well-known physician, who has resided and paid taxes within the second district for many years, was induced by the solicitation of many taxpayers to present himself as a candidate for the office of school director, to all the voters made by Mr. Wilson's resignation.

After the announcement was made in the papers of last Saturday morning, some of the individuals interested in the perpetuation of the present "high pressure" system, who are in opposition to the tax with the hope of ending upon means of preventing Dr. Strong's election, or of contesting his right to the office if elected, and to their great joy discovered that according to the record Dr. Strong was not a taxpayer, and therefore they declared him ineligible.

Upon an inquiry into the facts, it appears that by an error of the assessor, for which Dr. Strong is in no way responsible, the taxable property of the doctor was included in the separate property of his wife, but the property is duly assessed, and the tax thereon is as much a tax against him as if assessed in his own name. The doctor's attention having been called to the error in the record in the limited time remaining before the election, he thought best to withdraw his name.

It was perhaps too much to expect that Dr. Strong should, in addition to the time and labor he would have to devote to the duties of the office if elected, be burdened with a contest to obtain his seat, although when the true facts are made apparent his eligibility can scarcely be questioned.

It would be well, however, for those who have been so much interested in preventing Dr. Strong from running, and who have urged the vote be withheld from him, to mark with legislation to authorize the assessor to mark with the name of every taxpayer who has been prevented from voting by the assessor's error. On the 1st of July and the Fourth of July, the assessor should mark with the name of every taxpayer who has been prevented from voting by the assessor's error. On the 1st of July and the Fourth of July, the assessor should mark with the name of every taxpayer who has been prevented from voting by the assessor's error.

THE APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

Two weeks ago, at the school election in this city, when little interest was taken and the election passed off almost without observation, 907 votes were thrown. Yesterday, as the result of the great special effort to protect Mr. John Wilson, 153 votes were cast, and he was chosen only because there was no opposing candidate. Any well known citizen having the confidence of the public mind, have been called to one. The message vote cast for him, the full discussion of the subject has received, contains the opinion of the Union Democrats that the people do not approve of the present high pressure school system. Mr. Wilson has been of very high personal character, and there is no issue on that point, but his fellow citizens who concede this were unwilling to vote for him for school director, and so did not attend the election. He will now realize how far he has failed in his appeal to that constituency of 2800 votes, of which he has been the focus. He referred very slightly to the small number of votes at the annual meeting, and went to attendance at the school board, and the people of the district. He will now see, however, that that meeting was at least as representative in character as the vote which has again called him to the directorship. The "Onionists" have been mistaken. It has been aware from the first that the criticisms of the school board, and the opposition of the school board to the approval of three-fourths of the people. The school board which the system has resulted with good, and that is not yet. We do not at all regret the election of Mr. Wilson in the circumstances, since he is a very worthy man and will be a better director than the first that was elected. The school board is anxious to see the action of the school board to the approval of three-fourths of the people. The school board which the system has resulted with good, and that is not yet. We do not at all regret the election of Mr. Wilson in the circumstances, since he is a very worthy man and will be a better director than the first that was elected. The school board is anxious to see the action of the school board to the approval of three-fourths of the people.

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

FOR SALE: A FINE, NEW, 10-ROOM HOUSE, with a large lot, in a desirable location. Price, \$5000.00. Apply to J. K. GILL & CO., 25 and 30 First St., Portland.

NEWSPAPER ARCHIVE

NEWSPAPER ARCHIVE

